DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 101 780 JC 750 133

AUTHOR Collins, Charles C.; Case, Chester H.
TITLE The On-Site, Programmatic Approach to Staff Development.
PUB DATE Sep 74
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Conference on Graduate Education and the Community Colleges (Warrenton, Virginia, November 11-12, 1974)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Responsibility; *Administrator Role; College Teachers; Foundation Programs; Inservice Programs; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Junior Colleges; Professional Education; Program Administration; *Program Development; Staff Improvement; *Staff Orientation; Teacher Administrator Relationships; Teaching Skills
IDENTIFIERS *Los Medanos College; Professional Development Facilitator

ABSTRACT

At present, community college in-service professional development programs are not top quality. Little, if any, budgetary support is allocated for them, and responsibility for planning and carrying them out is allocated to no one in particular. The few on-site in-service professional development programs now in operation exhibit common elements and usually employ one of five organizational options. Under a three-year grant from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, Los Medanos College has developed a model for the induction and professional development of community college staff members. It is designed to serve five clienteles: new and inexperienced faculty, experienced faculty, classified staff, adjunct faculty, and administrators. The Professional Development Facilitator (PDF) is the most active agent in planning, implementing, and evaluating staff development activities. The PDF holds a staff, not line, position and reports directly to the President while serving in a resource relationship to the entire college staff. Graduate schools must develop better pre-service programs, programs for experienced community college faculty and administrators, and special programs for the preparation of future facilitators of staff development for the college campuses. (DC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED101780

The On-Site, Programmatic Approach to Staff Development

Charles C. Collins
Dean of Humanistic Studies

Chester H. Case
Professional Development Facilitator

JC 750 133

Los Medanos College
Pittsburg, California

September, 1974

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

There is a logic which argues for the on-site, programmatic approach to community college staff development. Perhaps this logic can be illustrated by reducing it to a forced choice, true or false test:

T__ F__ Millions of "new students" are now and will continue to flood the nation's community colleges.

T__ F__ Tens of thousands of community college teachers*, will be hired throughout this decade.

T__ F__ It takes premium quality teachers to maximize the potential of these culturally diverse, often high-risk students.

T__ F__ Senior colleges turn out subject area specialists but this is quite a different thing than turning out premium quality teachers.

T__ F__ In most community college districts, present in-service training programs are a cipher; are a false promise with no fulfillment.

T__ F__ Teaching, like most skills and arts, has to be learned by doing it.

T__ F__ The most promising place to transform subject area specialists into talented teachers is in the community college itself.

T__ F__ The appropriate time to convert subject area specialists into sensitive, skilled, dedicated instructors is during their first year(s) of teaching.

Documenting the "Yes" Answers

As this decade opened, there were over 1,000 community colleges spread throughout all fifty states with a staff of approximately 122,400 teachers, counselors, and administrators trying to give training and education to over two million students. The total faculty in 1967-68 represented more than a 375 percent increase over what it was in 1957-58.[4] The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education estimates that by 1980 there will be 3.6 to 4.3 million students enrolled in these two-year colleges.[1] By 1980, at least 216,000 staff members will be required;

---

*The word "teacher" will be used as a generic term to include instructors, counselors, librarians and other professional staff members.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

an increase of 93,700 during this decade or 9,370 new staff members each year.[5] Even more disturbing than the question of quantity is the question of quality. Certainly if reliance is placed upon present selection pools and present methods of preparation the outlook for the decade ahead is indeed bleak.

Only seven of the fifty states require any certificate or credential for community college instructors. One of the seven is California, and its pro forma credential comes upon request to those with a master's degree (or equivalent), who are free of tuberculosis and communism, and who can pay the $20 fee.[6] Of course credentials do not assure quality, and the above facts on credentialing are not presented in disparagement. The point being made is that the only minimum to quality control of faculty in the nation's community colleges is the prima facie evidence of subject area competence; i.e., a master's degree or equivalent in a specialty field.

Community college professionals are well aware that "command of subject" is not the heart of the matter. Most instructors are, if anything, over-prepared in their narrow specialty. The problem lies in the transmitting and the sharing of knowledge, attitudes, understanding, and wisdom between teacher and students. It is incredible that higher education has never paid much attention to the professional preparation of its practitioners. It is ironic when an educational institution puts such little value on educating itself. To be sure, universities have always sought teachers with command of the subject area, and professors have often been clever enough to become well-organized, articulate, even witty dispensers of information. Some professors--the self-critical, thoughtful, dedicated ones--have educated themselves to be great teachers. The point, of course, is that the development of a teacher should occur by design, not by chance.

It is folly for community colleges to act upon the adage that what is good enough for the universities is good enough for them. With a student population that ranges from low normal to genius, with a curriculum that includes everything from 7th grade arithmetic through the calculus, and with a year-after-year attrition rate that looks like the casualty figures for the Battle of Verdun, it is ridiculous for community colleges to assume that competence in subject matter is synonymous with competence as a teacher. Quality through mimicry is not quality at all.

Hiring practices testify to the awareness that education is infinitely more than a process of the well informed lecturing the poorly informed. In the academic year 1969-70, there were 1,781 full-time faculty members hired in the California community colleges. The richer and/or more attractively located community colleges "stole" 392 faculty members from poorer or less attractive colleges. Some 540 were recruited from the secondary schools while 344 had won their teaching spurs in four-year colleges. Although 459 had newly minted 1968-69 M.A. degrees, only 129 of the total number hired (1,781) had no prior teaching experience. Forty of these new teachers had had community college practice-teaching.[3]

College districts pay premium salaries for experienced teachers because they have little evidence or faith that the universities and senior colleges are providing much quality pre-service professional preparation. Joseph Cosand, former U.S. Deputy Commissioner of Education, spoke from long experience in the community colleges when he said:

> There are practically no strong pre-service collegiate programs for community college staff members, and those that are provide only a small fraction of the qualified personnel needed. Increasing numbers of so-called pre-service programs have been established, but they are generally inadequate or worse than nothing.[5]

With even stronger words, Joseph W. Fordyce, former President of the American Association of Junior Colleges, leveled this indictment against the pre-service preparation given in the nation's universities:

> Community-junior colleges have been required to a very large extent to remold and remake university graduates so that they can perform adequately as teachers at the community college level.[5]

True! But most community colleges are painfully aware that they themselves provide little, if any, in-service professional development. More often than not, inexperienced faculty members are so ingulfed by the 15-18 hour teaching load with two, maybe three, spanking new course preparations that they can hardly come up long enough to yell "help!" And, if they do call for assistance, who is there to answer? As to older faculty members, they usually look with juandiced eyes at the occasional superficial attempts to "up-grade" them. This is not to say that either experienced or inexperienced faculty would be antagonistic to professional development if it were top quality and if there were time to really pursue it.

The two reasons it is not often top quality are that little if any of the budget is allocated for it and responsibility for planning and carrying out a first-rate program most often falls between the administrative cracks. There is no one there to do it. The college president and the dean of instruction both mean well and often say kind words about professional development of the staff, but they know that they have neither the time nor the preparation to carry it off. So, it remains high on the rhetorical priorities and low on the behavioral priorities.

Perhaps the authority of the National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development will help change rhetoric into practice. The kernel of the advice they gave the White House in 1972 was this:

> Imaginative and potent educational programs for community-junior college staff which are supported by the federal government, state and local governments, four year colleges and universities, community-junior colleges, private foundations, and other appropriate agencies must be continued where they do exist and organized and developed where they do not, if the community-junior college concept is to survive at all, much less grow and mature in its contribution to American society.

And, most important, they went on to advise:

> While the need for pre-service programs is important, programs for the 70's should focus on in-service education.[5]

Some Commonalities of On-Site Programs

With recent drum-beating for professional development, a wide variety of on-site programs and activities have started up in numerous colleges, though for all the indictments and alarums by community college leaders fewer colleges than might be expected have moved beyond the stage of earnest intentions.

A quick look around reveals some commonalities in on-site programs. First they are do-it-yourself in the sense that affiliation or dependence upon graduate programs is minimal, though intreprenuerial experts from universities are engaged. Even so, these programs are not vacuum tight do-it-yourself inasmuch as each peeks over the others shoulders, most flock to any conference that announces a session on staff development, and all eagerly read any addition to the tiny literature on this subject.

The on-site programs invariably have a managing entity of some sort, try to find a center of faculty interests, tend to be episodic with menus of activities rather than integrated programs, usually depend upon existing personnel thereby heaping new responsibilities upon old ones, most often have limited funds, and compete with uneven success for campus resources. Though piously supported in words, most of them, in fact, buck prevailing headwinds in the form of negative faculty attitudes, overloaded work schedules, meagre incentive and award systems, campus politics and hurtful misconceptions of purpose.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Organizational Options

What can be termed an "officed" program is one of several options for the organization of on-site staff development. The essence of the officed program is that the staff development effort is assigned to a regularized administrative position and is given a budget and support services. At Los Medanos College, which will be used as the prime example in this report, the Professional Development Facilitator's Office is the central point for coordinating activities, and the Professional Development Facilitator (PDF) becomes the most active agent in the planning, doing and evaluating of staff development activities.

Other colleges organize according to another option, the "committee-ed" format,in which functions of program management, goal definition, allocation of resources, priority setting, are essentially determined by a committee constituted largely of faculty and, when lucky, served by an executive secretary type of functionary.

A third, the "hyphenated" option, prevails when staff development tasks are assigned to an administrative role already in existence, or when a new position of several mixed duty areas is created, e.g., the Associate Dean for Personnel Services becomes the Associate Dean for Personnel Services and Staff Development.

The "grass roots" option is the most naturalistic since it depends upon an unprompted surge of interest from within the college community to give impetus to a staff development activity. The "command performance" option is probably the best known and least liked. It is the type of activity which is defined from above on the basis of inferred or suspected needs and is administratively mandated. Those familiar with the old time opening-of-school-orientation programs or the "visiting fireman" approach will recognize this option.

Of these structures, the officed format for organization appears to have the greatest promise for maintaining a comprehensive staff development program. This format has also a potential danger of centralizing the developmental function to the extent of it becoming a "one person show". This could act to the detriment of broad college involvement especially if deans and department chairmen adopt a "let the development officer do it" viewpoint. The officed approach has the advantage of personalizing the developmental effort, of attaining and maintaining a high visibility, of making staff development an on-the-record college commitment and of offering accessable, highly personal and immediately available services to faculty and others.

The committee-ed approach has an advantage in that it will seem based upon broad representation within the college community. It will, in the venerable manner of committees, probably only undertake cautious activities already ordained to succeed since they have been tested, compromised, and limited in deliberations. It has the serious disadvantage of being impersonal and hard to get to, and certainly not the source a troubled instructor in need of assistance would approach for help.

The hypenated option has built in problems, stemming from the fact that the role will be overloaded already. And even if the dean-of-everything has the energy for the overload, the multiple functions of the role tend to compromise the ability of the incumbent to relate to persons in a confidential, non-judgemental fashion. Both the grass roots, and the command performance options can be effective in generating interest in topics, in conducting one-shot workshops, and in proding a reluctant faculty, but are plagued by a lack of continuity, vagaries of budgetary struggles, lack of coherence, and footdragging by the faculty.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

One On-Site Program: Los Medanos College

Los Medanos College, a new college in the Contra Costa Community College District, applied for and received generous financial assistance from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation to test and further develop a model for the induction and professional development of community college staff members.

This model shifts the primary locus of professional training from the university to the employing college; from pre-service training to in-service training. It parlays the induction of new staff members into the continued professional development of all staff members.[2] It enjoys all auspicious circumstances outlined as being the essential pre-conditions for successful on-site professional staff development.[7]

Since the Los Medanos College program concerns itself with all the personnel of the college, it is properly described as a total staff development program. The program is only now, in 1974-75, entering its second year and still at a very early stage in terms of experience and availability of evaluative data. The program is ambitious in design and intent. It is evolving.

Clienteles and Activities: The Los Medanos College program addresses itself to five intra-college clienteles. The clientele which has up to now received the largest share of attention and had the greatest activity is the group known as the Kellogg Fellows, the new and relatively inexperienced faculty who are participants in the induction phase of the program. The Kellogg Fellows participate in an intensive three to four week August seminar prior to the opening of classes and, during the induction year, attend a thrice weekly, two hour seminar while teaching a load reduced by 20 percent. Throughout this first year, they are given all the individual, personalized help that the Professional Development Facilitator can offer.

Another clientele is the experienced faculty, to whom the program is beginning to offer consultation, workshops, seminars, faculty retreats and opportunities to serve as teacher to teachers by means of "master classes" and as colleague-mentor to new faculty in the induction phase.

The classified staff is the third clientele. This sizable group is enrolled in a staff development seminar that meets weekly for several hours to receive orientation to the college, to discuss the college's philosophy and mission, to understand its business functions, and to explore aspects of communications and interpersonal relations.

Adjunct faculty (part-time and hourly instructors) is a fourth clientele. Orientation sessions, workshops, seminars, and consultation with administrators and regular faculty are all part of the planned activities for this group. This is, admittedly the clientele now getting the least help though probably needing it the most.

A fifth clientele is the administrative group, which is enrolled in a staff development seminar meeting weekly for two hours to discuss college operation, share information and experiences, explore solutions to problems and discuss issues arising out of assigned reading. Mini-courses are also designed for administrators to meet immediate needs, such as a mini-course dealing with in-class evaluative visits to faculty.

Structural Aspects: The structure of the staff development program is an integral part of the overall structure of the college. It is built into the organizational pattern, both the formal and the informal. The program has introduced several new roles, one being that of the Professional Development Facilitator (PDF). This is an administrative role, although of a special variety. The PDF holds a staff, not line, position and reports directly to the President while serving strictly in a resource relationship to the entire staff of the college.

Another role is that of Kellogg Fellow, already mentioned. The Fellow is a full time, fully responsible and fully participating faculty member during the induction year. It has been found important to assiduously avoid defining this role as "intern", or any other terms that could denote a kind of "rookie" status, or a less than first class citizenship. Salary, rights, and privileges are those of any first year faculty person. While the Fellow is full time, twenty percent of her/his load is assigned to staff development activities. In the plans, but not fully developed, are several other roles, such as faculty colleague-mentor, master class teacher and in-house consultant.

A Closer Focus on the Role of the Professional Development Facilitator: To erase any impression that the PDF is a kind of teacher educator in exile, a proprietor of a series of seminars, indication should be made of the variety of work that comes the PDF's way in the course of the day. The emphasis here will be on the one-to-one, personal kinds of service the PDF has the opportunity to offer.

This is not to demean the seminars, however, for they are the base for the Fellow-PDF relationships that bridge over into more personal contacts. Some examples of seminar topics and activities will help illustrate the point. Since the first day of class is a topic of prime concern, both practically and symbolically, the preparation of hand-outs, determining course policy, grading systems, the organization of materials, the setting of class norms, and the inevitable butterflies are early topics for consideration. They are dealt with at both the information level and the affective level. The follow-up on these topics comes in individual conferences, where the PDF can provide critical feedback on materials prepared by the Fellows, thus focusing on the immediate and particular circumstances of each Fellow. Also held are exercises in asking (and answering) questions and in giving understandable directions. Fellows teach one another for

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

video recording and critique. Options for the preparation of quizzes and exams are analyzed and evaluated. Instructional strategies such as simulations, groups learning and even the lecture are demonstrated and critiqued. These and numerous other teacherly concerns crowd into the seminar time along with discussions on student characteristics, debate on approaches to learning, sensitizing discussions to intergroup and intercultural relations, personal perceptions and feelings, and explorations of the role of the instructor.

The role is privileged. The PDF can work with a person in a non-judgemental, non-punitive fashion to facilitate simultaneous growth in several directions. A personal example: a Kellogg Fellow with little actual teaching experience sought suggestions on the development of course content. During several lengthy conferences, the dialogue widened to include goals, objectives, activities and evaluation procedures. But more than the building of an interesting unit transpired: there followed an augmented self confidence, an expanded self-concept, and lessened anxieties. The Fellow, needful at that point in time of an assist in settling into an instructor's role, experienced success in the classroom to the applause of a concerned administrator.

Another Fellow, this one having substantial teaching experience in the traditional mode, agreed to have the PDF record a class session on video tape. This Fellow came away from the playback with a renewed self respect, an awareness of several distracting mannerisms, and musing on the possibilities of personal growth. An experienced faculty member breaking in a new course, dropped by and in the course of conversation, raised several questions which led to conferences in which the PDF was able to supply some new inputs.

A day in the life of the PDF will see an almost dizzying sequence of events from formal, routine functions to leading seminars, planning activities, and very importantly, the one-to-one conversations and conferences. By being visible,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

available, an integral element in the organization of the college, and non-judgemental, the PDF role makes available for the needful member of college community, no matter how evanescent the need, the kind of personal, intimate services that go unfulfilled on most campuses.

Resources: The Staff Development Program at Los Medanos College enjoys access to essential resources, not the least of which is the generous funding of the W.K. Kellogg Foundation which for three years will defray the expense of the Fellow's released time, salaries for the PDF and secretary and certain other program costs. District money is a considerable contribution as well, defraying as it does operating expenses, overhead, and additional salary costs. More important, the District has committed itself to underwrite all costs of this program at the end of the three year Kellogg grant. The District has been willing to make this commitment since logic and first year experience argues that in the cost-benefit analysis, benefits will outweigh costs.

Another major resource resides within the personnel of the college. The Director of the Learning Resource Center is a key resource in those aspects dealing with curriculum development, instructional strategies, media, and evaluation. The president, deans, and directors are called upon for expertness in such areas as student characteristics, philosophy and history of community colleges, preparation of instructional objectives, community involvement, evaluation and endless other topics. The president is readily available as a participant, resource person, and clarifier of policy and procedure.

Goals of the Program: The goals of the program are broad, encompassing, and in all cases congruent with institutional goals. The program intends to establish and perpetuate an environment conducive to learning, to develop an understanding of and a loyalty to the goals and philosophy of the college by all members of the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

staff, to encourage the use by instructors of a wide range of instructional strategies consistent with college commitments to self-directed learning and use of media, to promote effectiveness in interpersonal relations and communications, to promote sensitivity to the needs of "new students", and to function effectively in a multicultural setting. More specific research goals of the program include the testing of the induction model and the exploration of the potentialities and limitations of the role of the PDF.

Present Status of the Program: The Program is now in its second year, with the second contingent of Kellogg Fellows at the outset of the induction phase. The Classified Program is entering its second year, as is the Administrator's Program. This year will see the inauguration of at least a limited program for adjunct faculty and an expanded involvement of experienced faculty in professional development.

Implications for Graduate Education

Assume for the moment that the on-site model for staff development proves successful. Assume that the Kellogg funded test at Los Medanos College demonstrates that apprentice teachers quickly become journeyman teachers, and that journeymen teachers often develop into master teachers. Further, accept for the moment the argument that the cost of this on-site program is, over the years, no more expensive than present practice of trying to buy quality by hiring experienced but expensive teachers. If all of these assumptions proved to be well founded what then would be the implications for graduate schools vis a vis community colleges?

Would on-site staff development result in closing down university operated internship programs for community college teachers? Yes, it might, but how many of these programs for teachers (not counselors or librarians) are viable operations

in 1974? At most, it would be an underwhelming loss to the community college movement.

Would on-site staff development obviate any need for undergraduate or graduate courses in psychology or sociology or personality theory or learning theory or history of education or philosophy of education or curriculum or educational technologies or other courses to be found in the catalogs of graduate schools of education? The answer is no! Right now, not many community college teachers are obliged to take any of these courses for the myth prevails that subject area competency as the Masters level or above is all that is needed to make a competent college teacher. Colleges sophisticated enough to inaugerate on-site professional development programs would also be accutely aware of the value of these background courses. Widespread adoption of the on-site induction model might indeed increase the enrollment in such graduate courses for they increase the readiness of the young teachers to profit from the in-service training.

Would on-site staff development run counter to the movement toward Doctor of Arts programs? Not likely, for graduates of such education oriented doctoral programs would simply become better candidates in the hiring process at community colleges. However, the preparation for the doctor of arts is not specific enough, nor local enough, nor sufficiently community college oriented to serve in lieu of the induction year that is an integral part of the Los Medanos College model. It is also true that excessive units and degrees make tyro teachers expensive hence some community colleges might be skeptical about getting their money's worth.

Would on-site staff development be an alternative option to field based graduate programs, i.e., approaches that put graduate university-based programs on community college campuses? Again the answer is no for field based graduate

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

programs are, as the name describes, graduate programs that have been moved to locations convenient to the students. Most such field based graduate programs are addressed to educational practitioners who seek advanced degrees in administration or in specialty areas in education. They are not moment to moment and day to day in-service training: certainly they do not begin to extend the tailored-to-the-individual kind of help which the Professional Development Facilitator spends his days in providing.

There are areas in which the graduate school programs with their payoffs in terms of certification, focused expertness, of engendering a "cosmopolitan" outlook can complement on-site efforts and in some cases fill in voids unservable by on-site programs. From these generalizations some final implications for graduate education can be drawn.

Just as the on-site programs need to define their clienteles, so also the graduate schools aspiring to offer programs for community college personnel need to define, or re-define, their most appropriate clients. A large and diverse but needful clientele is to be found in the experienced faculty members. In this huge contingent are numbers of successful instructors, masters of pedagogy and experts at curriculum who are nonetheless restless and in need of personally fulfilling activities that relate to them as persons and educators. Another clientele, which may or may not overlap the one previously suggested, are the faculty mobiles who have definable career objectives and need focused training in theory and practice in management skills, research skills, or advanced work in learning and curriculum.

Administrators constituted another clientele, but one which has traditionally been served by numerous programs in graduate education. A redefinition of this clientele might identify the "middle" management personnel (deans, division

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

chairmen, department heads) and tailor programs suited to their needs but not so extensive as degree programs.

Finally, there is an implication that has undertones of urgency. That is for the graduate schools to develop programs that prepare persons to serve as facilitators of staff development on the college campuses. Every college could conceivably find useful employment of a staff development officer. This person needs to be more than a master teacher now available, and more than a teacher educator in exile. It is a new field and one which the graduate program could marvellously serve by working in close cooperation--maybe even following the mandates--of the community colleges in designing a curriculum rich in praxis and theory.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SUPPORTING REFERENCES

1. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, The Open-Door Colleges, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

2. Collins, Charles C., "The Induction of Community College Instructors: An Internship Model," Available through ERIC, Powell Library, UCLA, Los Angeles.

3. Phair, Tom S., "New Full-Time Faculty Members in the 91 Public Community Colleges of California, 1969-1970 Academic Year," Unpublished report of the Office of Educational Career Services, University of California, Berkeley, 1970.

4. Medsker, L. and Tillery, D., Breaking the Access Barrier, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

5. National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development, "People for the People's College: Community Junior College Staff Development Priorities for the 70's": Washington, D.C., 1972.

6. Stinnett, T.M., A Manual on Certification Requirements for School Personnel in the United States, 1970 Edition, Washington, D.C.: The National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, N.E.A., 1970.

7. Yarrington, Rodger (Ed.), New Staff for New Teachers, Washington,. AACJC, 1974.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

MAR 07 1975

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION